

# NOTICE OF DECISION UNDER REGULATION 32 FILM POSTERS

## VIDEO SLICK

TO: The Film and Video Labelling Body Inc.  
PO Box 2627  
Ponsonby  
Auckland

Pursuant to regulation 32 of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Regulations 1994 the film poster entitled:

Australian Flesh On Video Vol. 2

Is **Not Approved.**

if approval refused, the reasons for the decision:

The video slick *Australian Flesh On Video Volume 2* is not approved. This is because the extent and degree to which it presents degrading and dehumanising images. As a result, the video slick would be likely to be classified objectionable if it were submitted for a decision on its classification.

The front cover of the video slick is dominated by a photograph of three naked men standing and holding their penises as if masturbating, while a woman lies at the level of their thighs. The woman's face, and the men's genitals, are obscured by beige rectangles, so that the woman's facial expression is completely obscured. The men look down; one of them appears to be grinning. The camera is at the level of the men's heads, looking down, so that the woman's body is in the distance. The men surround her closely. Sexually explicit text also surrounds the images; the caption on the woman's body reads, "Cock-hungry Meisha drains 'em all!"

The Classification Office is of the opinion that the video slick, if it were submitted under s13(1) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Act 1993 for a decision on its classification, would be likely to be classified as objectionable. This is because the image on the front cover conveys a degrading and menacing impression of the men crowding around the woman. The fact that her face is obscured means that her facial expression is not visible, and this, in combination with the men's postures, makes her appear vulnerable and dehumanises her. While the obscuring of the woman's face appears to be due to the convention on the remainder of the slick, which is that beige shapes obscure genitals, this convention is not immediately obvious. The effect of the image in question is particularly strong given that it dominates the front cover, and thus is likely to be a prominent image to anyone who views the slick.

Consideration has been given to the provisions of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990. The Classification Office considers that the video slick would be likely to be classified objectionable. Therefore, Regulation 28(3)(a) of the Films, Videos, and Publications Classification Regulations 1994 requires the Classification Office to not approve the video slick; this limitation is inconsistent with, and overrides, the right to freedom of expression.

.....

Date: 04 October 1999

For the Classification Office (signed):

OFLC Ref: 9901712